



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,119	09/26/2007	Francois Boumazza	RFR0146	3806
27305 7590 05/01/2009 HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS PLLC 450 West Fourth Street Royal Oak, MI 48067				
EXAMINER				
ROMAIN, PINEL E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3612				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/01/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/588,119

Applicant(s)

BOUMAZA ET AL.

Examiner

PINEL E. ROMAIN

Art Unit

3612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/26/07.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1- 12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 August 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-893)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/27/09

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 6-12 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative and cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, Examiner will assume claims 6-12 are dependent on claim 1.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-8 and 10,11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schmidt et al.(US Pg.Pub. - 2005/0229530)

- a. Consider claim 1, Schmidt discloses a composite structure comprising a **metal insert (1, fig. 3)** having a shaped core (fig. 3) of chosen profile, possessing two opposed **marginal regions** (Fig.3) and also a **plastic reinforcement (7, fig.1)** over molded on at least part of the insert, characterized in that the core (12) of the insert includes at least one deep-drawn portion (3, fig. 1) which extends in a generally transverse direction with respect to at least one of the marginal regions of the core, and in that the reinforcement includes at least one reinforcing element (7, fig.3) which covers the deep-drawn portion of the insert and which connects two end regions of the reinforcement covering the two marginal regions (near5, fig.3) of the core , respectively.

- b. Consider claim 2, Schmidt disclosed the composite structure as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that the deep-drawn portion () is a groove (fig.2), and in that the reinforcing element is a rib (7, fig.1) which is accommodated in the groove (3).
- c. Consider claim 3, the composite structure as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that the deep-drawn portion is a rib (3,fig.4) and in that the reinforcing element is a rib (7) which covers the rib (3, fig.5).
- d. Consider claim 4, Schmidt discloses the composite structure as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that the deep-drawn portion forms on the one hand, a **groove (3, fig.1 defined a "a long narrow channel or depression" by Mirriam-Webster's dictionary)** which emerges on one face of the core and, on the other hand, a rib (7, fig.3) which emerges on another face of the core, and in that the reinforcing element forms, on one side, a first rib (7, fig.3) which covers the groove (3, fig.1) of the insert and_on the other side, a second rib (3,fig. 2) which covers the rib (3) of the insert.
- e. Consider claim 5, 6 Schmidt discloses the composite structure as claimed in one of claims 1, characterized in that the core of the insert has an **open profile (fig.2)** in particular a U-shaped profile, with an **internal face (5, fig.3)** and an **external face (4, fig. 2)** and in that the deep-drawn portion is formed on the internal face of the core. (at 1, fig.2).
- f. Consider claim 7 Schmidt discloses, the composite structure as claimed in one of claims 1 characterized in that at least one of **the end regions** of the reinforcement is arranged in the form of a **lip (at 5, fig. 5)** which covers a marginal region of the core.

g. Consider claim 8, Schmidt discloses the composite structure as claimed in one of claims 1, characterized in that at least one of the end regions of the reinforcement is arranged in the form of a **notched edge** (10 at 11, fig.4).

h. Consider claim 10, Schmidt discloses the composite structure as claimed in one of claims 1, characterized in that the deep-drawn portion of the insert extends from one of the marginal regions of the core to the other (fig.3).

i. Consider claim 11, Schmidt discloses the composite structure as claimed in one of claims 1, characterized in that the deep-drawn portion extends **over part** (fig.4. para .0023) the core between the marginal regions of the core.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmidt.

a. Consider claim 9, Schmidt fails to disclose the reinforcement is arranged in the form of a raised edge. It is common knowledge in the art to have raised edge on a composite structure. Applicant may seasonally challenge, for the official record in this application, this and any other statement of judicial notice in timely manner in response to this office action. Please specify the exact statement to be challenged. Applicant is reminded, with respect to the specific challenge put forth, of the duty of disclosure under

Rule 56 to disclose material which is pertinent to patentability including claim rejections challenged by applicant.

5. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmidt in View of Bauhoff (W0 02/068258).

j. Consider claim 12, Schmidt discloses the composite structure as claimed in one of claims 1, that it forms an integral part of at least one element of a motor vehicle front face. However, Bauhoff disclose a composite structure that forms an integral front end module platform. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify apparatus in claim 1 taught by Schmidt with front end module taught by Bauhoff to achieve a high strength support for headlamps.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PINEL E. ROMAIN whose telephone number is (571)270-7013. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday From 7:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Dayoan can be reached on 571-272-6659. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dennis H. Pedder/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3612

/PINEL E ROMAIN/
Examiner, Art Unit 3612